arXiv:1610.03839v2 [math.OC] 13 Oct 2016

Variational approximation of functionals defined on 1-dimensional connected sets: the planar case

M. Bonafini*, G. Orlandi†, É. Oudet‡

October 12, 2016

Abstract

In this paper we consider variational problems involving 1-dimensional connected sets in the euclidean plane, such as the classical Steiner tree problem and the irrigation (Gilbert-Steiner) problem. We relate them to optimal partition problems and provide a variational approximation through Modica-Mortola type energies proving a full Γ-convergence result. We also introduce a suitable convex relaxation and develop the corresponding numerical implementations. The proposed methods are quite general and the results we obtain can be extended to n-dimensional euclidean space or to more general manifold ambients, as shown in the companion paper [11].

1 Introduction

Connected one dimensional structures play a crucial role in very different areas like discrete geometry (graphs, networks, spanning and Steiner trees), structural mechanics (crack formation and propagation), inverse problems (defects identification, contour segmentation), etc. The modeling of these structures is a key problem both from the theoretical and the numerical point of view. Most of the difficulties encountered in studying such one dimensional objects are related to the fact that they are not canonically associated to standard mathematical quantities. In this article we plan to bridge the gap between the well-established methods of multi-phase modeling and the world of one dimensional connected sets or networks. Whereas we strongly believe that our approach may lead to new point of views in quite different contexts, we restrict here our exposition to the study of two standard problems in the Calculus of Variations which are respectively the classical Steiner tree problem and the Gilbert-Steiner problem (also called the irrigation problem).

The Steiner Tree Problem (STP) [21] can be described as follows: given N points $P_1, \dots, P_N$ in a metric space X, (e.g. X a graph, with P_i assigned vertices), find a connected (sub-)graph $F \subset X$ containing the points P_i and having minimal length. Such

*Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Trento, Italy, e-mail: mauro.bonafini@unitn.it
†Dipartimento di Informatica, Università di Verona, Italy, e-mail: giandomenico.orlandi@univr.it
‡Laboratoire Jean Kuntzmann, Université de Grenoble Alpes, France, e-mail: edouard.oudet@imag.fr

an optimal graph F turns out to be a tree and is thus called a *Steiner Minimal Tree* (SMT). In case $X = \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$ endowed with the euclidean ℓ^2 metric, one refers often to the *euclidean* or *geometric* STP, while for $X = \mathbb{R}^d$ endowed with the ℓ^1 (Manhattan) distance or for X contained in a fixed grid $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ one refers to the *rectilinear* STP.

Here we will adopt the general metric space formulation of [30]: given a metric space X, and given a compact (possibly infinite) set of terminal points $A \subset X$, find

$$\text{(STP)} \qquad \inf\{\mathcal{H}^1(S),\, S \text{ connected},\, S \supset A\},$$

where $\mathcal{H}^1$ indicates the 1-dimensional Hausdorff measure on X. Existence of solutions for (STP) relies on Golab compactness theorem for compact connected sets, and it holds true also in generalized cases (e.g. $\inf \mathcal{H}^1(S)$, $S \cup A$ connected).

Problems like (STP) are relevant for the design of optimal transport channels or networks connecting given endpoints, for example the optimal design of net routing in VLSI circuits in the case $d = 2, 3$. The Steiner Tree Problem has been widely studied from the theoretical and numerical point of view in order to efficiently devise constructive solutions, mainly through combinatoric optimization techniques. Finding a Steiner Minimal Tree is known to be a NP hard problem (and even NP complete in certain cases), see for instance [6, 7] for a comprehensive survey on PTAS algorithms for (STP).

The situation in the euclidean case is theoretically well understood: given N points $P_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ a SMT connecting them always exists, the solution being in general not unique (think for instance to symmetric configurations of the endpoints P_i). The SMT is a union of segments connecting the endpoints, possibly meeting at 120° in at most $N-2$ further branch points, called *Steiner points*.

Nonetheless, the quest of computationally tractable approximating schemes for (STP) has recently attracted a lot of attention in the Calculus of Variations community, due to different variational interpretations of (STP) as respectively a size minimization problem for 1-dimensional connected sets [26, 20], an optimal branched transport problem [10, 16], or even a Plateau problem in a suitable class of vector distributions endowed with some algebraic structure [26, 23], to be solved by finding suitable *calibrations* [24]. Several authors have proposed different approximations of the problem, whose validity is essentially limited to the planar case, mainly using a phase field based approach together with some coercive regularization, see e.g. [12, 19, 28, 13].

Our aim is to propose a variational approximation for (STP) and for the Gilbert-Steiner irrigation problem (in the equivalent formulations of [33, 22]) in the euclidean case $X = \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$. In this paper we focus on the planar case $d = 2$ and prove a genuine Γ-convergence result (see Theorem 3.8 and Proposition 3.2) by considering integral functionals of Modica-Mortola type [25]. In the companion paper [11] we rigorously prove that certain integral functionals of Ginzburg-Landau type (see [1]) yield a variational approximation for (STP) and of the irrigation problem valid in any dimension $d \geq 3$. This approach is related to the interpretation of (STP) as a Plateau problem in a cobordism class of integral currents with multiplicities in a suitable normed group as studied by Marchese and Massaccesi in [23] (see also [26] for the planar case). Our method is quite general and may be easily adapted to a variety of situations (e.g. in manifolds or more general metric space ambients, with densities or anisotropic norms, etc.).

The plan of the paper is as follows: in Section 2 we reformulate (STP) and the irrigation problem as a suitable modification of the optimal partition problem in the planar case. In section 3, we state and prove our main Γ-convergence results, respectively Proposition 3.2 and Theorem 3.8. Inspired by [18], we introduce in section 4 a convex relaxation of the corresponding energies. In Section 5 we present our approximating scheme for (STP) and for the Gilbert-Steiner problem and illustrate its flexibility in different situations, showing how our convex formulation is able to recover multiple solutions whereas Γ-relaxation detects any locally minimizing configuration. Finally, in Section 6 we propose some examples and generalizations that are extensively studied in the companion paper [11].

2 Irrigation-type problems for euclidean graphs and optimal partitions

In this section we describe some optimization problems on euclidean graphs with fixed endpoints set A, like (STP) or irrigation-type problems, following the approach of [23, 22] and we rephrase them as optimal partitions-type problems in the planar case $\mathbb{R}^2$.

2.1 Oriented graphs and rank one tensor valued measures

Let $A = \{P_1, ..., P_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$, be a given set of N terminal points, with $N > 2$. To any compact connected set $K \supset A$ with $\mathcal{H}^1(K) < +\infty$, we associate in a canonical way an *oriented acyclic graph* L connecting the endpoints set A such that $\mathcal{H}^1(L) \leq \mathcal{H}^1(K)$. Following the proof of [23], Lemma 2.1, we construct a compact connected subset $L \subset K$ such that $A \subset L$ and L is described as the union $L = \cup_{i=1}^{N-1} \lambda_i$, where λ_i are simple rectifiable curves with finite length having P_i as initial point and P_N as final point, oriented by $\mathcal{H}^1$-measurable vector fields τ_i, such that $\tau_i(x) = \tau_j(x)$ for $\mathcal{H}^1$- a.e. $x \in \lambda_i \cap \lambda_j$ (i.e. the orientation of λ_i is coherent with that of λ_j on their intersection). Remark further that $\lambda_i \cap \lambda_j$ contains P_N and is connected for any $1 \leq i, j \leq N-1$ (otherwise L would contain cycles).

In other words, if we identify the curves λ_i with the vector measures $\Lambda_i = \tau_i \otimes \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \lambda_i$, all the information concerning this canonical oriented acyclic graph L is encoded in the rank one tensor-valued measure $\Lambda = \tau \otimes g \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L$, where the $\mathcal{H}^1$-measurable vector field $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$ carrying the orientation of the graph L satisfies $\operatorname{spt} \tau = L$, $|\tau| = 1$, $\tau = \tau_i$ $\mathcal{H}^1$-a.e. on λ_i, and the $\mathcal{H}^1$-measurable vector field $g \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ has components g_i satisfying $g_i \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L = \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \lambda_i = |\Lambda_i|$, with $|\Lambda_i|$ the total variation measure of the vector measure $\Lambda_i = \tau \otimes \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \lambda_i$. Observe that $g_i \in \{0, 1\}$ a.e. for any $1 \leq i \leq N-1$.

Remark 2.1 Observe that the measures Λ_i verify the property

$$\operatorname{div} \Lambda_i = \delta_{P_N} - \delta_{P_i} \qquad \text{for any } 1 \leq i \leq N-1\,. \tag{2.1}$$

Definition 2.2 *Given the above canonical description $L = \cup_{1 \leq i \leq N-1} \lambda_i$ of the acyclic graph L having terminal points set $A = \{P_1, ..., P_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and oriented by τ, we call the*

above constructed $\Lambda = \tau \otimes g \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L$ *the canonical* $\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$*-valued measure representation of the oriented graph* L*.*

Given an acyclic graph $L = \cup_i \lambda_i$ connecting $\{P_1, ..., P_N\}$ canonically represented by the tensor valued measure Λ, the measure $\mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L$ corresponds to the smallest positive measure dominating $|\Lambda_i| = \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \lambda_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq N-1$, where $|\Lambda_i|$ is the total variation measure of the vector measure $\Lambda_i = \Lambda \cdot e_i = \tau \otimes (g \cdot e_i) \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L$. It is thus given by $\mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L = \sup_i \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \lambda_i = \sup_i |\Lambda_i|$, the supremum of the total variation measures $|\Lambda_i|$.

Remark 2.3 An equivalent definition of the measure $\mu = \sup_{1 \leq i \leq N-1} \mu_i$, for μ_i positive Radon measures on $\mathbb{R}^d$, can be given by duality: we have, for any positive $\psi \in C_c^0(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi \, d\mu = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_i \, d\mu_i \, , \ \varphi_i \in C_c^0(\mathbb{R}^d), \ \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \varphi_i(x) \leq \psi(x) \right\}.$$

If now we define the total variation measure of Λ by

$$|\Lambda| := |\tau| \left(\sup_{1 \leq i \leq N-1} g_i \right) \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L \, , \tag{2.2}$$

we obtain the identity $|\Lambda| = \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L$. Observe that $|\Lambda|$ is independent of the orientation $\pm\tau$ of L, hence for $\Lambda = -\tau \otimes g \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L = \tau \otimes (-g) \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L$, we must have $|\Lambda| = \sup_{1 \leq i \leq N-1} |g_i| \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L = -\inf_{1 \leq i \leq N-1} (-g_i) \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L$. We may summarize this fact by setting

$$|\Lambda| := \Phi_0(\tau \otimes g) \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L \, , \tag{2.3}$$

where $\Phi_0(\tau \otimes g) = \sup_{1 \leq i \leq N-1} g_i$ for $|\tau| = 1$ and $g_i \in \{0, 1\} \ \forall 1 \leq i \leq N-1$, while $\Phi_0(\tau \otimes g) = -\inf_{1 \leq i \leq N-1} g_i$ for $|\tau| = 1$ and $g_i \in \{0, -1\} \ \forall 1 \leq i \leq N-1$.

Remark 2.4 (graphs as G**-currents)** In [23], the rank one tensor measure $\Lambda = \tau \otimes g \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L$ identifying a graph in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is defined as a *current* with coefficients in the group $\mathbb{Z}^{N-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$. For $\omega \in \mathcal{D}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ a smooth compactly supported 1-differential form and $\vec{\varphi} = (\varphi_1, ..., \varphi_{N-1}) \in [\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)]^{N-1}$ a smooth test (vector) function, one sets

$$\langle \Lambda, \omega \otimes \vec{\varphi} \rangle := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \omega \otimes \vec{\varphi}, \tau \otimes g \rangle \, d|\Lambda| = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \omega, \tau \rangle \varphi_i g_i d|\Lambda| = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \omega, \tau \rangle \varphi_i \, d|\Lambda_i| \, .$$

Moreover, fixing a norm Ψ on $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$, one may define the Ψ-total variation of the current Λ as

$$||\Lambda||_\Psi = |\Lambda|_\Psi(\mathbb{R}^d) = \sup \left\{ \langle \Lambda, \omega \otimes \vec{\varphi} \rangle \, , \ \ |\omega(x)| \leq 1 \, , \ \Psi^*(\vec{\varphi}(x)) \leq 1 \right\} , \tag{2.4}$$

where Ψ^* is the dual norm to Ψ w.r.t. the scalar product on $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$.

Remark 2.5 (non canonical representations of L) Let L be an oriented acyclic graph with terminal points set $A = \{P_1, \dots, P_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and denote by τ' its given orientation. Consider a finite system of simple curves $\lambda'_j \subset L$, $1 \le j \le M$ having (only) its endpoints in A (whence $M \ge N-1$), with given orientation τ'_j such that $L = \cup_j \lambda'_j$. We have $\tau' \cdot \tau'_j = \pm 1$ on λ'_j, so that the system of oriented curves λ'_j induces a representation of L via the rank one tensor-valued measure $\Lambda' = \tau' \otimes g' \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L$, with the measurable vectorfield $g' \in \mathbb{R}^M$ whose components $g'_j \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ are defined by $g'_j \tau' = \tau'_j$ on λ'_j and $g'_j = 0$ elsewhere, in order to have that the j-th component Λ'_j of the tensor Λ', given by $\Lambda'_j = \tau \otimes (g \cdot e_j)\mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L$, for $e_j \in \mathbb{R}^M$, is actually the vector measure $\Lambda_j = \tau' \otimes (g'_j)\mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L = \tau'_j \otimes \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \lambda'_j$. In particular we have $|\Lambda'_j| = |g'_j| \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \lambda'_j = \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \lambda'_j$.

2.2 Irrigation-type functionals

In this section we consider functionals defined on oriented graphs connecting a fixed set $A = \{P_1, ..., P_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \ge 2$, by using their canonical representation as rank one tensor-valued measures, in order to identify the graph with an *irrigation plan* from the point source P_N to the target set $\{P_1, ..., P_{N-1}\}$ (or viceversa). We focus here on suitable energies in order to describe the irrigation problem and the Steiner tree problem in a common framework as in [23, 22]. We observe moreover that the irrigation problem with one point source (I_α) introduced by Xia [33], in the equivalent formulation of [22], approximates the Steiner tree problem as $\alpha \to 0$ in the sense of Γ-convergence (see Proposition 2.7).

We first introduce some additional notation: let be given positive measures μ_i on $\mathbb{R}^d$, for $i = 1, ..., M$ to form a $\mathbb{R}^M$-valued vector measure $\vec{\mu}$. Let $|\vec{\mu}|_1 = \sum_i \mu_i$, so that $\vec{\mu} = g \otimes |\vec{\mu}|_1$ with $g \in \mathbb{R}^M$, $0 \le g_i \le 1$ for $1 \le i \le M$, $\sum_i g_i = 1$. Accordingly, we denote $|\vec{\mu}|_\infty$ the supremum measure $|\vec{\mu}|_\infty = \sup_i \mu_i = \sup_i g_i \, |\vec{\mu}|_1$. For $p \ge 1$ define the measure $|\mu|_p := |g|_p |\vec{\mu}|_1$, with $|g|_p = (\sum_i g_i^p)^{1/p}$ the ℓ^p norm of $g \in \mathbb{R}^M$. We have the coerciveness property

$$\frac{1}{M} |\vec{\mu}|_1 \le |\vec{\mu}|_\infty \le |\vec{\mu}|_q \le |\vec{\mu}|_p \le |\vec{\mu}|_1, \quad \forall\, 1 < p < q \,, \forall\, \vec{\mu} \,. \tag{2.5}$$

More generally, for Ψ a norm on $\mathbb{R}^M$, we define the measure $\Psi(\vec{\mu}) := \Psi(g)|\vec{\mu}|_1$. In particular, we have the characterization

$$\Psi(\vec{\mu})(\mathbb{R}^d) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^M \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_i \, d\mu_i, \; 0 \le \varphi_i \in C_c^0(\mathbb{R}^M) \; \forall\, 1 \le i \le M, \quad \Psi^*(\vec{\varphi}) \le 1 \right\} \tag{2.6}$$

with Ψ^* the dual norm to Ψ w.r.t. the euclidean structure on $\mathbb{R}^M$. The total variation of the measure $\Psi(\vec{\mu})$ coincides with the Ψ-total variation $||\Lambda||_\Psi$ as defined in (2.4), where $\Lambda = \tau \otimes \vec{\mu}$ for any $|\vec{\mu}|_1$-measurable unit vector field $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Let $\Lambda = \tau \otimes \vec{\mu} = \tau \otimes g |\vec{\mu}|_1$ be a rank one $\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^M$-valued measure with $|\tau| = 1$. For $0 < \alpha \le 1$ define

$$\mathcal{F}^\alpha(\Lambda) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |g|_{1/\alpha} d|\vec{\mu}|_1 = |\vec{\mu}|_{1/\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d) \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}^0(\Lambda) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |g|_\infty d|\vec{\mu}|_1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\sup_{1\leq i\leq M} \mu_i \right) = |\vec{\mu}|_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d). \tag{2.8}$$

In other words, $\mathcal{F}^\alpha(\Lambda) = ||\Lambda||_{\Psi_\alpha}$, $\mathcal{F}^0(\Lambda) = ||\Lambda||_{\Psi_0}$ are total variation-type functionals, with respect to the norms $\Psi_\alpha = |\cdot|_{\ell^{1/\alpha}}$ and $\Psi_0 = |\cdot|_{\ell^\infty}$.

When $\Lambda = \tau \otimes g\mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L$ canonically represents an oriented acyclic graph L, so that in particular we have $|\tau| = 1$ and $g_i \in \{0, 1\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq M$, we deduce

$$\mathcal{F}^0(\Lambda) = \int_L |g|_\infty d\mathcal{H}^1 = \mathcal{H}^1(L)\,, \qquad \mathcal{F}^\alpha(\Lambda) = \int_L |g|_{1/\alpha} d\mathcal{H}^1 = \int_L |\theta|^\alpha d\mathcal{H}^1\,, \tag{2.9}$$

where $\theta(x) = \sum_i g_i(x)^{1/\alpha} = \sum_i g_i(x) \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $0 \leq \theta(x) \leq M$. We thus recognize that minimizing the functional $\mathcal{F}^\alpha$ among graphs L connecting $P_1, .., P_{N-1} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ to $P_N \in \mathbb{R}^d$ solves the irrigation problem with point source P_N and target $P_1, ..., P_{N-1}$ (see [22]), while minimizing $\mathcal{F}^0$ among graphs L with endpoints set $\{P_1, ..., P_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ solves (STP) in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Since both $\mathcal{F}^\alpha$ and $\mathcal{F}^0$ are total variation-type functionals (thanks to the key coerciveness property 2.5), minimizers do exist in the class of rank one tensor valued measures. The fact that the minimization problem within the class of canonical tensor valued measure representing oriented graphs has a solution in that class is a consequence of compactness properties of Lipschitz maps (in $\mathbb{R}^2$, it follows alternatively by the compactness theorem in the SBV class [5]). Actually, existence of minimizers in the canonically oriented graph class in $\mathbb{R}^2$ can be deduced as a byproduct of our Γ-convergence result (see Corollary 3.5 and Corollary 3.6) and in $\mathbb{R}^d$, for $d > 2$, by the parallel Γ-convergence analysis contained in the companion paper [11].

Remark 2.6 A minimizer of $\mathcal{F}^0$ (resp. $\mathcal{F}^\alpha$) among tensor valued measures representing admissible graphs Λ corresponds necessarily to the canonical representation of a minimal graph, i.e. either $g_i \geq 0\ \forall\, 1 \leq i \leq N-1$ or (reversing the orientation) $g_i \leq 0\ \forall\, 1 \leq i \leq N-1$, for if $g_i = -g_j$ on a connected arc in $\lambda_i \cap \lambda_j$, with λ_i going from P_i to P_N and λ_j going from P_j to P_N, this implies that $\lambda_i \cup \lambda_j$ contains a cycle, hence Λ cannot be a minimizer.

Proposition 2.7 *The functional $\mathcal{F}^0$ is the Γ-limit, as $\alpha \to 0$, of the functionals $\mathcal{F}^\alpha$ with respect to the convergence of measures.*

Proof: Observe that $\|g\|_q \leq \|g\|_p$ for $1 \leq q < p \leq +\infty$, $g \in \mathbb{R}^M$, and moreover $\|g\|_q \to \|g\|_\infty$ as $q \to +\infty$. Hence, we have that, for the $\mathbb{R}^M$-valued measure $V = g \otimes |V|_1$, $\mathcal{F}^\alpha(V) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \|g\|_{1/\alpha} d|V|_1$ is a monotonic increasing sequence as $\alpha \to 0$, so that $\mathcal{F}^\alpha \xrightarrow{\Gamma} \mathcal{F}^0$ by elementary properties of Γ-convergence, see for instance Remark 1.40 of [15]. □

2.3 Oriented graphs and partitions of $\mathbb{R}^2$

This section is dedicated to the two-dimensional case. The following result states that two acyclic graphs having the same endpoints set give rise to a partition of $\mathbb{R}^2$, or equivalently

(see [5]), that their oriented difference corresponds to the orthogonal distributional gradient of a piecewise integer valued function having bounded total variation. Recall that a simple rectifiable curve in $\mathbb{R}^2$ is the image of an injective lipschitz map $f : [0,1] \subset \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ having finite length. Piecewise C^1 (resp. polygonal) simple curves of finite length are rectifiable.

Lemma 2.8 *Let $\{P_1, \dots, P_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and let $L = \cup_{i=1}^{N-1} \lambda_i$, $S = \cup_{i=1}^{N-1} \sigma_i$ be two oriented acyclic graphs s.t. λ_i and σ_i are rectifiable simple curves connecting P_i to P_N, and let respectively $\Lambda_i = \tau_i \otimes \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \lambda_i$ and $\Sigma_i = \tau_i' \otimes \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \sigma_i$ be the associated vector measures.*

Then, for any $1 \leq i \leq N-1$ there exists a function $u_i \in SBV(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{Z})$ such that, denoting $Du_i = \nu_i \otimes |Du_i|$ and $Du_i^\perp = \nu_i^\perp \otimes |Du_i|$ respectively the measures representing the gradient and the orthogonal gradient of u_i, we have $Du_i^\perp = \Sigma_i - \Lambda_i$ for any $1 \leq i \leq N-1$.

The union of the connected components of the preimages $\cup_{i=1}^{N-1} u_i^{-1}(m_i)$, for $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $1 \leq i \leq N-1$ form a partition of $\mathbb{R}^2$. We give now two alternative proofs of Lemma 2.8, based respectively on the (equivalent) notions of winding number and on intersection number.

Proof of Lemma 2.8. Fix $i \in \{1, ..., N-1\}$ and consider simple oriented polygonal curves $\lambda_{i,k}$ and $\sigma_{i,k}$ with fixed endpoints P_i and P_N such that the Hausdorff distance to respectively λ_i and σ_i is less than $\frac{1}{k}$ and the length of $\lambda_{i,k}$ (resp. $\sigma_{i,k}$) are monotonically increasing and converge to the length of λ_i (resp. σ_i). Consider moreover the oriented closed curves $\gamma_i = \lambda_i \cup \sigma_i$ and $\gamma_{i,k} = \lambda_{i,k} \cup \sigma_{i,k}$ obtained by reversing the orientation of σ_i and $\sigma_{i,k}$, and suppose w.l.o.g. that they are oriented counterclockwise.

For a fixed $x \notin \operatorname{spt} \gamma_i$, define

$$u_i(x) = \operatorname{Ind}_{\gamma_i}(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi\, i} \oint_{\gamma_i} \frac{1}{x-z} dz = \frac{1}{2\pi\, i} \oint_{\gamma_{i,k}} \frac{1}{x-z} dz$$

for sufficiently large k (depending on x). We have that $u_i(x) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and the (connected components of the) sets $E_m = u_i^{-1}(m)$, for $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, form a Caccioppoli partition of $\mathbb{R}^2$, since $\mathcal{H}^1(\partial^* E_m) \leq \mathcal{H}^1(\lambda_i \cup \sigma_i)$ we deduce so far that $u_i \in GSBV(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{Z})$ (see [5], sections 4.4 and 4.5), $\operatorname{spt} Du_i \subset \gamma_i$ and in particular $Du_i = |u_i^+ - u_i^-| \nu_i \otimes \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \gamma_i$, where ν_i is a normal vector to γ_i at any differentiability point z_0 of γ_i, and

$$u_i^\pm(z_0) = \lim_{\rho \to 0} \frac{1}{|B_\rho(z_0)^\pm|} \int_{B_\rho(z_0)^\pm} u_i \,,$$

where $B_\rho(z_0)^\pm = B_\rho(z_0) \cap \{z \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \gamma_i, \operatorname{sign}[(z - z_0) \cdot \nu] = \pm 1\}$.

To this purpose observe that $\lambda_{i,k}$ and $\sigma_{i,k}$ are simple, and that w.l.o.g. they meet transversally in a finite number of intersection points $Q_1 = P_i, .., Q_{m_k} = P_N$. Let π_1 and π_2 permutations of $\{1, ..., m_k\}$ such that $Q_{\pi_1(j)} \equiv Q_j'$ precedes $Q_{\pi_1(j+1)} \equiv Q_{j+1}'$ in the ordering induced by the orientation of $\lambda_{i,k}$ and $Q_{\pi_2(j)} \equiv Q_j''$ follows $Q_{\pi_2(j+1)} \equiv Q_{j+1}''$ in the ordering induced by the orientation of $\sigma_{i,k}$.

We may thus see $\gamma_{i,k}$ as the union of suitable Jordan curves $\gamma_{i,k,\ell}$, $1 \leq \ell \leq n_k \leq m_k$, each one bounding a connected component of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \gamma_{i,k}$, whose pairwise intersection belongs to the set $\{Q_1, ..., Q_{m_k}\}$, and having the same orientation as $\gamma_{i,k}$, i.e. counterclockwise. To identify $\gamma_{i,k,1}$ consider the piece of $\lambda_{i,k}$ connecting $P_i = Q_1 = Q'_1$ to $Q'_2 = Q''_{j_1}$ for some j_1, followed by the piece of $\sigma_{i,k}$ connecting Q''_{j_1} to $Q''_{j_1-1} = Q'_{j_2}$, followed in turn by the piece of $\lambda_{i,k}$ connecting Q'_{j_2} to $Q'_{j_2+1} = Q''_{j_3}$ and so on an so forth till coming back to $P_i = Q'_1$ along a piece of $\sigma_{i,k}$.

Consider now $\gamma_{i,k} \setminus \gamma_{i,k,1}$ and repeat the argument starting from Q'_{i_1}, with i_1 the minimal index such that $Q'_{i_1} \in \gamma_{i,k} \setminus \gamma_{i,k,1}$, yielding $\gamma_{i,k,2}$. Inductively, consider $\gamma_{i,k} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{r} \gamma_{i,k,j}$, i_r the minimal index such that $Q'_{i_r} \in \gamma_{i,k} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{r} \gamma_{i,k,j}$, and repeat the preceding construction on $\gamma_{i,k} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{r} \gamma_{i,k,j}$ starting from Q'_{i_r}. The process ends after a finite number of steps.

Now, for any differentiability point $z_0 = (x_0, y_0) \in \gamma_i$ suppose w.l.o.g. that in the rectangle $R_{\alpha,\beta} = [x_0 - \alpha, x_0 + \alpha] \times [y_0 - \beta, y_0 + \beta]$, for suitable $\alpha, \beta > 0$ sufficiently small both $\gamma_i \cap R_{\alpha,\beta}$ and $\gamma_{i,k} \cap R_{\alpha,\beta}$ (for k sufficiently large) are graphs of lipshitz functions $f_i, f_{i,k} : [x_0 - \alpha, x_0 + \alpha] \to [y_0 - \beta, y_0 + \beta]$. Since u_i is piecewise constant, we have

$$u_i^+(z_0) - u_i^-(z_0) = u_i(x_0, y_0 + \beta) - u_i(x_0, y_0 - \beta) = u_{i,k}(x_0, y_0 + \beta) - u_{i,k}(x_0, y_0 - \beta)$$

It remains to prove that the difference is $u_{i,k}(x_0, y_0+\beta) - u_{i,k}(x_0, y_0-\beta) = 1$. But observe that, for $p \notin \gamma_{i,k}$,

$$u_{i,k}(p) = \mathrm{Ind}_{\gamma_{i,k}}(p) = \sum_{\ell} \mathrm{Ind}_{\gamma_{i,k,\ell}}(p)$$

and that $\mathrm{Ind}_{\gamma_{i,k,\ell}}(p)$ is 0 if p belongs to the unbounded connected component of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \gamma_{i,k,\ell}$ or 1 if p belongs to the bounded one. Let $\gamma_{i,k,\bar{\ell}}$ such that $\gamma_{i,k,\bar{\ell}} \cap R_{\alpha,\beta} = \gamma_{i,k} \cap R_{\alpha,\beta}$. Then $(x_0, y_0+\beta)$ and $(x_0, y_0-\beta)$ belong to two distinct connected components of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \gamma_{i,k,\bar{\ell}}$, and in view of the counterclockwise orientation of $\gamma_{i,k,\bar{\ell}}$, we have that $\mathrm{Ind}_{\gamma_{i,k,\bar{\ell}}}(x_0, y_0 + \beta) = 1$ and $\mathrm{Ind}_{\gamma_{i,k,\bar{\ell}}}(x_0, y_0 - \beta) = 0$ if the unit tangent τ_i of γ_i is such that $\tau_i \cdot e_1 > 0$ at z_0, and viceversa in case $\tau_i \cdot e_1 < 0$.

In particular, since by construction of $\gamma_{i,k,\ell}$, both $u_{i,k}(x_0, y_0 + \beta)$ and $u_{i,k}(x_0, y_0 - \beta)$ belong to the same connected component of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \gamma_{i,k,\ell}$ for $\ell \neq \bar{\ell}$, we have

$$u_{i,k}(x_0, y_0 + \beta) - u_{i,k}(x_0, y_0 - \beta) = \mathrm{Ind}_{\gamma_{i,k,\bar{\ell}}}(x_0, y_0 + \beta) - \mathrm{Ind}_{\gamma_{i,k,\bar{\ell}}}(x_0, y_0 - \beta) = \pm 1.$$

Let $\nu_i = \tau_i^{\perp}$ be a unit normal to γ_i. Then we have $Du_i(z_0) = |u_i^+ - u_i^-|(z_0)\nu_i$ and $Du_i^{\perp}(z_0) = -\tau_i(z_0)$.

Hence we have $|Du_i|(\mathbb{R}^2) = \mathcal{H}^1(\gamma_i)$ and by the Poincaré inequality in BV (u_i is compactly supported), $\|u\|_{L^1} \leq C_i |Du_i|(\mathbb{R}^2) < +\infty$. Hence $u_i \in SBV(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{Z})$ and the conclusion follows.

□

Alternative proof of Lemma 2.8. The construction here is by approximation and slicing. Consider a polygonal approximation $\gamma_{i,k}$ of γ_i made out from a finer and finer

partition of γ_i, so that $\mathcal{H}^1(\gamma_{i,k}) \to \mathcal{H}^1(\gamma_i)$ monotonically and $\gamma_{i,k}$ is uniformly close to γ_i. Fix a direction $e \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$ so that the line $\{P(t) = v + te,\ t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ intersects $\gamma_{i,k}$ transversally at $P_j = v + t_j e$, for $1 \le j \le M$. Fix $s_0 < t_1$ and set $u(P(s_0)) = 0$, and set $u(P) = 0$ for P in the connected component of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \gamma_{i,k}$ containing $P(s_0)$. For $j \ge 1$ fix $s_j \in (t_j, t_{j+1})$ and set $u(P(s_j)) = u(P(s_{j-1})) - \operatorname{sign} e \cdot \tau^\perp$, where τ is a clockwise orientation of $\gamma_{i,k}$. Extend $u \equiv u_{i,k}$ to be piecewise constant to the connected components of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \gamma_{i,k}$ containing $P(s_j)$. Repeat the procedure until exhausting $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \gamma_{i,k}$. The procedure is well-defined because if $P(s_j)$ and $P(s_\ell)$ belongs to the same connected component, the oriented arc $\alpha_{j\ell}$ connecting them in the complement of $\gamma_{i,k}$ together with the segment $P_{j\ell}$ form an oriented boundary, so that the intersection number with the oriented boundary $\gamma_{i,k}$ is zero, and it corresponds precisely to

$$0 = \sum_{j \le h \le \ell} \operatorname{sign} (e \cdot \tau^\perp)(P(s_h)) = \sum_{j \le h \le \ell} u(P(s_h)) = u(P(s_\ell)) - u(P(s_j))\,.$$

We deduce that $Du_{i,k}^\perp = \tau \otimes \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \gamma_{i,k}$, hence $|Du_{i,k}|(\mathbb{R}^2) = \mathcal{H}^1(\gamma_{i,k})$ and $\|u_{i,k}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)} \le C_i |Du_{i,k}|(\mathbb{R}^2)$ by Poincaré inequality in BV. Hence $u_{i,k} \in SBV(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{Z})$ is an equibounded sequence in norm and by Rellich compactness theorem there exists a subsequence still denoted $u_{i,k}$ converging in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ to a $u_i \in SBV(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{Z})$. We deduce that u_i is constant on balls not intersecting γ_i since they do not intersect $\gamma_{i,k}$ for large k, hence $\operatorname{spt} Du_i = \gamma_i$. Let now $z_0 \in \gamma_i$ a differentiability point, B_0 a ball centered in z_0 of sufficiently small radius such that $B_0 \setminus \gamma_i$ has two connected components. let $P_1, P_2 \in B_0 \setminus \gamma_i$ belong to those components, we have $u_i(P_1) = u_{i,k}(P_1)$ and $u_i(P_2) = u_{i,k}(P_2)$ for sufficiently large k since $\gamma_{i,k}$ converges uniformly to γ_i and $u_{i,k}$ is piecewise constant. In particular $u_i(P_1) - u_i(P_2) = u_{i,k}(P_1) - u_{i,k}(P_2) = \pm 1$ and we easily conclude that $Du_i^\perp = \tau \otimes \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \gamma_i$. □

Remark 2.9 According to Definition 2.2, we may assume w.l.o.g. that the tensor-valued measures $\Lambda = (\Lambda_1, ..., \Lambda_{N-1})$ and $\Sigma = (\Sigma_1, ..., \Sigma_{N-1})$ are of rank one, more precisely $\Lambda = \tau \otimes (|\Lambda_1|, ..., |\Lambda_{N-1}|) = \tau \otimes g \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \lambda$, $\Sigma = \tau' \otimes (|\Sigma_1|, ..., |\Sigma_{N-1}|) = \tau' \otimes g' \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \sigma$, where $\tau = \tau_i = \tau_j$ $\mathcal{H}^1$ a.e. on $\lambda_i \cap \lambda_j$, $\tau' = \tau_i' = \tau_j'$ $\mathcal{H}^1$ a.e. on $\sigma_i \cap \sigma_j$ and $g = (g_1, ..., g_{N-1})$, $g' = (g_1', ..., g_{N-1}')$, $g_i, g_i' \in \{0, 1\}$.

In this case it follows that the tensor-valued measure $DU = (Du_1, ..., Du_{N-1})$ constructed in Lemma 2.8 has the form

$$DU = \nu \otimes (|Du_1|, ..., |Du_{N-1}|) = \nu \otimes h \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner (\lambda \cup \sigma), \qquad \nu \in \mathbb{R}^2,\ h \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}, \quad (2.10)$$

$\nu = 1$ $\mathcal{H}^1$ a.e. on $\operatorname{spt} DU$, and $h_i \in \{0, 1\}$ for any $1 \le i \le N-1$.

In other words, DU is of rank one and the jumps of the components u_i of U are unitary (i.e. $|u_i^+ - u_i^-| = 1$ on $\operatorname{spt} Du_i$).

Remark 2.10 Given any $u_i \in SBV(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{Z})$ such that $Du_i \llcorner \lambda_i = \Lambda_i$ for any $1 \le i \le N-1$, we have that the support of $Du_i^\perp \llcorner (\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \lambda_i)$ contains a rectifiable oriented curve σ_i joining P_i to P_N. In fact, λ_i, being contained in the support of Du_i, is contained in a connected component γ_m^i of the rectifiable curve $\partial^* E_m$, where $E_m = u_i^{-1}(m, +\infty)$, for a

suitable $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence $\sigma_i = \gamma_m^i \setminus \lambda_i$ has P_i and P_N as endpoints. It follows $\sigma = \cup_{i=1}^{N-1}\sigma_i$ is a connected oriented acyclic graph with endpoints $P_1, ..., P_N$.

Remark 2.11 Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ as above. For $i = 1, ..., N-1$ let γ_i be the oriented segment joining P_i to P_N, denote $\tau_i = \frac{P_N - P_i}{|P_N - P_i|}$ its orientation, and identify it with the vector measure $\Gamma_i = \tau_i \otimes \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \gamma_i$. Then $\gamma = \cup_{i=1}^{N-1}\gamma_i$ is an oriented acyclic graph connecting the endpoint set A and $\mathcal{H}^1(\gamma) = |\Gamma|(\mathbb{R}^2)$, where $|\Gamma| = \sup_i |\Gamma_i|$.

Corollary 2.12 *Let γ be any canonical representation of an oriented acyclic graph connecting the terminal points $P_1, ..., P_N \in \mathbb{R}^2$ (for instance the oriented acyclic graph considered in Remark 2.11). For any rectifiable oriented acyclic graph L as in Lemma 2.8 we have*

$$\mathcal{H}^1(L) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sup_i |\Lambda_i| = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sup_i |Du_i^\perp - \Gamma_i|$$

for suitable $u_i \in SBV(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{Z})$, $1 \le i \le N-1$.

If L satisfies the rank one condition of Remark 2.9, then

$$DU^\perp = (Du_1^\perp, ..., Du_{N-1}^\perp) = \tau \otimes g \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L \text{ with } |\tau| = 1 \text{ and } g_i \in \{0, 1\}\ \mathcal{H}^1 - a.e. \text{ on } L.$$

Remark 2.13 In the case $P_1, ..., P_N \in \partial\Omega$ with $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ a convex set, we may choose $\gamma = \cup_{i=1}^{N-1}\gamma_i$ with γ_i connecting P_i to P_N and $\operatorname{spt}\gamma_i \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega$. Denoting $\omega_i \subset \partial\Omega$ the projection of γ_i on $\partial\Omega$, we deduce by Corollary 2.12

$$\mathcal{H}^1(L) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sup_i |Du_i^\perp|$$

for suitable $u_i \in SBV(\Omega; \mathbb{Z})$ such that $u_i = 1$ on $\omega_i \subset \partial\Omega$ and $u_i = 0$ elsewhere in $\partial\Omega$, $1 \le i \le N-1$. We recover here an alternative formulation of the optimal partition problem in a convex planar set Ω as studied for instance in [3] and [4].

3 Γ-convergence

In this section we state and prove our main Γ-convergence result, namely Proposition 3.2 and Theorem 3.8.

Lemma 3.1 *Let Ψ be a norm on $\mathbb{R}^M$, and $\varepsilon > 0$. Consider positive measures $\mu_{1,\varepsilon}, ..., \mu_{M,\varepsilon}$ and $\mu_1, ..., \mu_M$ satisfying*

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\mu_{i,\varepsilon} \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\mu_i \quad \forall\ \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d),\ \varphi \ge 0,\ \forall\, 1 \le i \le M\,. \tag{3.1}$$

Then we have

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\, d\Psi(\vec{\mu}_\varepsilon) \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\, d\Psi(\vec{\mu}) \quad \forall \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d),\ \varphi \ge 0, \tag{3.2}$$

where $\vec{\mu}_\varepsilon = (\mu_{1,\varepsilon}, ..., \mu_{M,\varepsilon})$ *and* $\vec{\mu} = (\mu_1, ..., \mu_M)$. *Assuming instead*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\mu_{i,\varepsilon} \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\mu_i \quad \forall\ \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d),\ \varphi \ge 0,\ \forall 1 \le i \le M\,, \tag{3.3}$$

then it holds

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\, d\Psi(\vec{\mu}_\varepsilon) \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\, d\Psi(\vec{\mu}) \quad \forall \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d),\ \varphi \ge 0. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof: Fix $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\varphi \ge 0$. By (2.6) we deduce that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi d\Psi(\vec{\mu}_\varepsilon) = \sup\left\{ \sum_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\xi_i d\mu_{i,\varepsilon}\,, \quad \xi_i \ge 0, \quad \Psi^*(\vec{\xi}) \le 1 \right\},$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\, d\Psi(\vec{\mu}_\varepsilon) &\ge \liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \sum_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\xi_i d\mu_{i,\varepsilon} \\ &\ge \sum_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\xi_i\, d\mu_i \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

for any $\xi_i \ge 0$, $\Psi^*(\vec{\xi}) \le 1$, whence, again by (2.6), conclusion (3.2) follows.

To prove (3.4) observe that (2.6) implies

$$\sum_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\xi_i\, d\mu_i \ \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\, d\Psi(\vec{\mu}) \quad \forall \xi_i \ge 0\,, \Psi^*(\vec{\xi}) \le 1,$$

hence (3.3) gives

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} \sum_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\xi_i\mu_{i,\varepsilon} \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi\, d\Psi(\vec{\mu}) \quad \forall \xi_i \ge 0\,, \Psi^*(\vec{\xi}) \le 1,$$

and applying again (2.6) to the l.h.s., conclusion (3.4) follows.

□

Proposition 3.2 *Let* $P_1, \dots, P_N \in \mathbb{R}^2$ *be distinct points of the plane. For any* $i = 1, ..., N-1$ *consider the measure* $\Gamma_i = \tau_i \otimes \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \gamma_i$ *defined in remark 2.11, and consider the Modica-Mortola type functionals*

$$F_\varepsilon^i(u, B) = \int_B e_\varepsilon^i(u) = \int_B |Du^\perp - \Gamma_i|^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} W(u), \tag{3.6}$$

defined for $u \in H_i \equiv W^{1,2}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \gamma_i) \cap BV(\mathbb{R}^2)$ *and* $B \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{P_1, ..., P_N\}$ *open, where* $W(u) \ge 0$ *is a smooth 1-periodic potential vanishing on* $\mathbb{Z}$ *(take for example,* $W(u) = \sin^2(\pi u)$*). Let* $c_0 = 2\int_0^1 \sqrt{W(s)}\, ds$ *(*$c_0 = \frac{2}{\pi}$ *for* $W(s) = \sin^2(\pi s)$*). We have:*

1. **(Compactness and lower bound inequality)** *For any $u_{i,\varepsilon} \in W^{1,2}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2\setminus\gamma_i)\cap BV(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $F^i_\varepsilon(u_{i,\varepsilon}, B) \le C(B)$ for any $B \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{P_1, ..., P_N\}$ open, $1 \le i \le N-1$, there exists $u_i \in SBV(\mathbb{R}^2;\mathbb{Z})$ such that (up to a subsequence) $u_{i,\varepsilon} \to u_i$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Moreover,*

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int \varepsilon \sum_i \varphi_i e^i_\varepsilon(u_{i,\varepsilon})\, dx \ge c_0 \int \sum_i \varphi_i d|Du_i^\perp - \Gamma_i| \tag{3.7}$$

for any $\varphi_i \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{P_1, ..., P_N\})$, $\varphi_i \ge 0$, for any $1 \le i \le N-1$.

2. **(Upper bound (in)-equality)** *For any $u_i \in SBV(\mathbb{R}^2;\mathbb{Z})$, $1 \le i \le N-1$, there exists a sequence $u_{i,\varepsilon} \in W^{1,2}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \gamma_i) \cap BV(\mathbb{R}^2)$ s.t. $u_{i,\varepsilon} \to u_i$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int \varepsilon \sum_i \varphi_i e^i_\varepsilon(u_{i,\varepsilon})\, dx \le c_0 \int \sum_i \varphi_i d|Du_i^\perp - \Gamma_i| \tag{3.8}$$

for any $\varphi_i \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{P_1, ..., P_N\})$, $\varphi_i \ge 0$, for any $1 \le i \le N-1$.

Remark 3.3 Observe that energy-bounded sequences $u_{i,\varepsilon} \in H_i$, that are involved in statements 1) and 2) of Proposition 3.2, verify $\lim_{|x|\to+\infty} u_{i,\varepsilon(x)} = 0$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $1 \le i \le N-1$.

Remark 3.4 Proposition 3.2 holds true also in case the measures Γ_i are associated to oriented simple polyhedral (or even rectifiable) finite length curves joining P_i to P_N.

Proof of Proposition 3.2 Observe first that it suffices to prove (3.7) and (3.8) in the case $\varphi_i = 0$ for $i \ne j$, for a fixed $j \in \{1, ..., N-1\}$, and $\varphi_j = \mathbf{1}_B$ the characteristic function of an arbitrary open set (say a ball) $B \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Then the conclusion follows by approximating the test functions φ_i by simple functions $\sum_k \alpha_k \mathbf{1}_{B_k}$, with $\{B_k\}_k$ a disjoint family of open sets B_k, thanks to the regularity of the Radon measures involved in the statement.

We thus fix $1 \le j \le N-1$ and a ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and we distinguish two cases, according to whether $B \cap \gamma_j = \emptyset$ or not. In the first case we have

$$F^j_\varepsilon(u, B) \equiv \int_B e^j_\varepsilon(u) = \int_B |Du^\perp|^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} W(u)$$

and (3.7), (3.8) (with $\varphi_j = \mathbf{1}_B$, $\varphi_i = 0$ for $i \ne j$) follows by the classical result of Modica-Mortola [25] applied to $F^j_\varepsilon(u, B)$.

In the case $B \cap \gamma_j \ne \emptyset$ we follow the arguments of [8], and consider $u_0 = \mathbf{1}_{B^+}$, where $B^+ = \{z \in B \setminus \gamma_j\,,\ (z - z_0)\cdot\nu > 0\}$, for $z_0 \in B \cap \gamma_j$ and $\nu^\perp = \tau_j$, so that $Du_0^\perp = \Gamma_j \llcorner B$. Letting $v = u - u_0$ we have $Dv^\perp = Du^\perp - \Gamma_j$ on B and $W(v) = W(u)$ on B by 1-periodicity of the potential W. Hence

$$F^j_\varepsilon(u, B) = \int_B e^j_\varepsilon(u) = \int_B |Dv^\perp|^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} W(v) \equiv \tilde{F}^j_\varepsilon(v, B)$$

and conclusions (3.7), (3.8) follow again in case $\varphi_j = \mathbf{1}_B$, $\varphi_i = 0$ for $i \ne j$ by applying Modica-Mortola theorem [25] to $\tilde{F}^j_\varepsilon(v, B)$.

□

Corollary 3.5 (Γ-convergence) *Let $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \to [0, +\infty)$ be a norm on $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$. In the notation of Proposition 3.2, let $H = H_1 \times ... \times H_{N-1}$, and consider the functionals*

$$\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^\Psi(U, B) = \int_B \varepsilon \Psi(\vec{e}_\varepsilon(U))\, dx\,, \qquad \text{for } U = (u_1, ..., u_{N-1}) \in H, \tag{3.9}$$

$$\mathcal{F}^\Psi(U, B) = \int_B \Psi(\vec{g}) d|DU^\perp - \vec{\Gamma}|_1\,, \qquad \text{for } U \in SBV(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{Z}^{N-1}), \tag{3.10}$$

for $B \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{P_1, ..., P_N\}$ open, where we set $\vec{e}_\varepsilon(U) = (e_\varepsilon^1(u_1), ..., e_\varepsilon^{N-1}(u_{N-1}))$, $\vec{g} = (g_1, ..., g_{N-1})$ and, for $1 \le i \le N-1$,
$|Du_i^\perp - \Gamma_i| = g_i |DU^\perp - \vec{\Gamma}|_1$, with $|DU^\perp - \vec{\Gamma}|_1 := \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} |Du_i^\perp - \Gamma_i|$. Then we have

1. **(Compactness and lower bound inequality)** *$\forall\ U_\varepsilon \in H$ such that $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^\Psi(U_\varepsilon, B) \le C(B)$, $B \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{P_1, ..., P_N\}$, there exists $U \in SBV(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{Z}^{N-1})$ such that (up to a subsequence) $U_\varepsilon \to U$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^{N-1})$. Moreover,*

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^\Psi(U_\varepsilon, B) \ge c_0 \mathcal{F}^\Psi(U, B) \tag{3.11}$$

2. **(Upper bound (in)-equality)** *For any $U \in SBV(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{Z}^{N-1})$ there exists a sequence $U_\varepsilon \in H$ such that $U_\varepsilon \to U$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^{N-1})$ and*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^\Psi(U_\varepsilon, B) \le c_0 \mathcal{F}^\Psi(U, B) \tag{3.12}$$

for any $B \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{P_1, ..., P_N\}$ open.

Proof: To prove (3.11) apply Lemma 3.1, formula (3.2) to the measures $\mu_\varepsilon^i = \varepsilon e_\varepsilon^i(u_{i,\varepsilon}) dx$ and $\mu_i = c_0 |Du_i^\perp - \Gamma_i| = g_i |DU^\perp - \vec{\Gamma}|_1$ that verify (3.1) in view of (3.7). Analogously, to prove (3.12), given the measures $\mu_i = c_0 |Du_i^\perp - \Gamma_i| = g_i |DU^\perp - \vec{\Gamma}|_1$, consider the measures $\mu_\varepsilon^i = \varepsilon e_\varepsilon^i(u_{i,\varepsilon}) dx$ verifying (3.8). Then (3.3) is verified and hence formula (3.4) applies, to give (3.12).

□

Corollary 3.6 (Convergence of minimizers) *Let $U_\varepsilon \in H$ be a sequence of minimizers for $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^\Psi$ in H. Then (up to a subsequence), $U_\varepsilon \to U$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and $U \in SBV(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{Z}^{N-1})$ is a minimizer of $\mathcal{F}^\Psi$ in $SBV(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{Z}^{N-1})$.*

Proof: Let $V \in SBV(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{Z}^{N-1})$, and let $V_\varepsilon \in H$ such that $\limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^\Psi(V_\varepsilon, B) \le \mathcal{F}^\Psi(V, B)$ for any $B \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{P_1, ..., P_N\}$. Hence we have, since (3.11) holds and $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^\Psi(U_\varepsilon, B) \le \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^\Psi(V_\varepsilon, B)$,

$$\mathcal{F}^\Psi(U, B) \le \liminf_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^\Psi(U_\varepsilon, B) \le \limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon^\Psi(V_\varepsilon, B) \le \mathcal{F}^\Psi(V, B)$$

for any $B \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{P_1, ..., P_N\}$.

□

Remark 3.7 (Rank one property and unit jumps) We may assume without loss of generality that a minimizer $V = (v_1, ..., v_{N-1}) \in SBV(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{Z}^{N-1})$ of $\mathcal{F}^\Psi$ has the additional property that DV is a rank-one tensor-valued measure (cf. Remark 2.10) and V has unit jumps $|{v_i}^+ - {v_i}^-| = 1$ on $\operatorname{spt} Dv_i$ for $1 \le i \le N-1$.

To prove this fact, let $U = (u_1, ..., u_{N-1})$ be a minimizer of $\mathcal{F}^\Psi$ in $SBV(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{Z}^{N-1})$, and denote $\Sigma_i = Du_i^\perp - \Gamma_i$. Then $\Sigma_i = \tau_i \otimes \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \sigma_i$ and according to Remark 2.10 σ_i contains a rectifiable curve σ_i' connecting P_i to P_N. Form the oriented acyclic subgraph $\sigma' = \sigma_1' \cup ... \cup \sigma_{N-1}'$ connecting $P_1, .., P_{N-1}$ to P_N, associated to the rank one tensor measure Σ'. Then by Lemma 2.8, there exists $U' = (u_1', ..., u_{N-1}') \in SBV(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{Z}^{N-1})$ such that $\Sigma_i' = |Du_i'^\perp - \Gamma_i|$ (hence $DU'^\perp$ is a rank one tensor measure) and $|Du_i'| = |{u_i'}^+ - {u_i'}^-| \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \sigma_1' \cup \gamma_i = \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \sigma_1' \cup \gamma_i$, i.e. u_i' has unit jumps $|{u_i'}^+ - {u_i'}^-| = 1$.

Moreover, $\mathcal{F}^\Psi(U') \le \mathcal{F}^\Psi(U)$, (supports and jumps have been decreased), hence we have found a minimizer $U' \in SBV(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{Z}^{N-1})$ of $\mathcal{F}^\Psi$ having unit jumps $|{u_i'}^+ - {u_i'}^-| = 1$ on $\operatorname{spt} Du_i'$ and with $DU' = \nu \otimes g \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner (\sigma' \cup \lambda)$ a rank-one tensor-valued measure with either $g_i \in \{0, 1\}\ \forall\, 1 \le i \le N-1$ or $g_i \in \{0, -1\}\ \forall\, 1 \le i \le N-1$.

□

Corollaries 3.5 and 3.6 together with Remark 3.7 may be summarized, in case $\mathcal{F}^\Psi$ corresponds respectively to $\mathcal{F}^0$ and $\mathcal{F}^\alpha$ for $0 < \alpha \le 1$, in the following

Theorem 3.8 *Let $A = \{P_1, .., P_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\Gamma_i = \tau \otimes \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \gamma_i$, for $1 \le i \le N-1$, as in Remark 2.11. For $U = (u_1, ..., u_{N-1})$, $u_i \in W^{1,2}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \gamma_i) \cap BV(\mathbb{R}^2)$, define*

$$\mathcal{F}^0_\varepsilon(U, B) = \int_B \varepsilon \sup_{1 \le i \le N-1} e^i_\varepsilon(u_i)\, dx\,,$$

and, for $0 < \alpha \le 1$,

$$\mathcal{F}^\alpha_\varepsilon(U, B) = \int_B \varepsilon \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} e^i_\varepsilon(u_i)^{1/\alpha} \right)^\alpha dx\,,$$

where $B \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{P_1, ..., P_N\}$ is open and the energy densities $e^i_\varepsilon(u_i)$ are defined in Proposition 3.2, formula (3.6)*, and let*

$$\mathcal{F}^0(U, B) \equiv \mathcal{F}^0(DU^\perp - \Gamma, B)\,, \qquad \mathcal{F}^\alpha(U, B) \equiv \mathcal{F}^\alpha(DU^\perp - \Gamma, B) \tag{3.13}$$

be defined as in (2.8) *and* (2.7)*. Let moreover $c_0 > 0$ be as defined in Proposition 3.2. Then we have*

$$\mathcal{F}^0_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\Gamma} c_0 \mathcal{F}^0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{F}^\alpha_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\Gamma} c_0 \mathcal{F}^\alpha\,,$$

where the Γ-convergence takes place with respect to the strong topology of $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^{N-1})$. In particular, up to subsequences, minimizers U_ε of $\mathcal{F}^0_\varepsilon$ converge, as $\varepsilon \to 0$, to $U \in SBV(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{Z}^{N-1})$ with $DU^\perp - \Gamma = \tau \otimes g \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L$, and L a Steiner Minimal Tree with terminal points in A, while minimizers V_ε of $\mathcal{F}^\alpha_\varepsilon$ converge (up to subsequences), as $\varepsilon \to 0$, to $V \in SBV(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{Z}^{N-1})$, where $DV^\perp - \Gamma = \tau' \otimes g' \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L_\alpha$ represents an optimal α-irrigation plan with point source P_N and targets $P_1, .., P_{N-1}$.

4 Convex relaxation

In this section we propose convex relaxations of the irrigation-type functionals $\mathcal{F}^\alpha$ for $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ so as to include the Steiner tree problem corresponding to $\alpha = 0$ (notice that the case $\alpha = 1$ corresponds to the well-known Monge-Kantorovich optimal transportation problem with respect to the Monge cost $c(x, y) = |x - y|$).

More precisely, we consider convex relaxations of the functional defined by $\mathcal{F}^\alpha(\Lambda) = \|\Lambda\|_{\Psi_\alpha}$ if the tensor valued measure Λ is the canonical representation of an acyclic graph with terminal points $\{P_1, ..., P_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, so that in particular Λ is of rank one and the $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued measures Λ_i corresponding to its columns verify $\operatorname{div} \Lambda_i = \delta_{P_N} - \delta_{P_i}$ (see Definition 2.2 and Remark 2.1), and $\mathcal{F}^\alpha(\mu) = +\infty$ for any other $\mathbb{R}^{d\times(N-1)}$-valued measure in $\mathbb{R}^d$ verifying (2.1).

First of all let us discuss the convex relaxation of $\mathcal{F}^\alpha$ to the class of rank one tensor-valued Radon measures $\tau \otimes \vec{\mu} = \tau \otimes h \cdot |\vec{\mu}|_1$, where $\operatorname{div}(\tau \otimes \vec{\mu}) = (\delta_{P_N} - \delta_{P_1}, ..., \delta_{P_N} - \delta_{P_{N-1}})$, $|\tau| = 1$, $h \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$, $|h|_\infty \leq 1$ and $|\vec{\mu}|_1$ indicates the total variation measure of $\tau \otimes \vec{\mu}$. This class includes the set of oriented graphs with real valued weights, corresponding to $|\vec{\mu}|_1$ absolutely continuous w.r.t. $\mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L$.

Let Φ_0 be the function defined in (2.3). In order to deal with non-canonical representations of L as a $\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$-valued measure (see Remark 2.5), or with relaxations of a given problem stated for canonical graphs, one has to consider convex positively 1-homogeneous extensions of Φ_0 on $\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$.

First of all, for $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}_+ \cup \mathbb{R}^{N-1}_-$ (with $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}_+$ the positive orthant of $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}_-$ the negative one), set $\Phi_0(\tau \otimes h) := |\tau| \Phi_{00}(h)$, where

$$\Phi_{00}(h) = \sup_{1\leq i\leq N-1} |h_i| = |h|_\infty,$$

or equivalently $\Phi_{00}(h) = \sup_i h_i$ if $h \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}_+$, $\Phi_{00}(h) = -\inf_i h_i$ if $h \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}_-$. Let $\tilde{\Phi}_0$ be any convex positively 1-homogeneous extension of Φ_0 to $\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$. Then we have

$$\tilde{\Phi}_0(\tau \otimes h) = |\tau| \cdot \Psi(h) \qquad \forall\, (\tau, h) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \tag{4.1}$$

for a convex positively 1-homogeneous Ψ on $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ (i.e. a norm) verifying

$$|h|_\infty \leq \Psi(h) \leq \Phi^{**}_{00}(h) \qquad \forall\, h \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}, \tag{4.2}$$

where Φ^{**}_{00} represents the convex 1-homogeneous envelope of Φ_{00} on $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$, i.e. the maximal convex 1-homogeneous extension of Φ_{00} to $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$, which is given by

$$\Phi^{**}_{00}(h) = \sup_{1\leq i\leq N-1} h_i^+ \; - \inf_{1\leq i\leq N-1} h_i^-, \tag{4.3}$$

with $h_i^+ = \max\{h_i, 0\}$ and $h_i^- = \min\{h_i, 0\}$. Notice that in [23] the norm Ψ on $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ (see Remark 2.4) employed in order to find solutions of (STP) using calibrations corresponds precisely to $\Psi = \Phi^{**}_{00}$.

Denote now (still) by Ψ_α and Ψ_0 any convex positively 1-homogeneous extensions to $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$of the restriction to the positive and negative orthants of respectively $\Psi_\alpha(\cdot) = |\cdot|_{1/\alpha}$

and $\Psi_0(\cdot) = |\cdot|_\infty$. This yields the relaxed functionals (still denoted $\mathcal{F}^\alpha$) $\mathcal{F}^\alpha(\Lambda) = ||\Lambda||_{\Psi_\alpha}$ and $\mathcal{F}^0(\Lambda) = ||\Lambda||_{\Psi_0}$, (cf. (2.4)) defined for any $\Lambda = \tau \otimes h\mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L$, $|\tau| = 1$, $h \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$. We have in particular (with the convention $1/0 = \infty$)

$$|h|_{1/\alpha} \leq \Psi_\alpha(h) \leq \Phi^{**}_{\alpha 0}(h) \qquad \forall\, h \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}, \tag{4.4}$$

with $\Phi^{**}_{\alpha 0}$ the convex 1-homogeneous envelope of $\Phi_{\alpha 0}$ on $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$, where $\Phi_{\alpha 0}(h) = |h|_{1/\alpha}$ on the positive and negative orthants of $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ and $\Phi_{\alpha 0}(h) = +\infty$ elsewhere in $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$. Notice that $\Phi^{**}_{\alpha 0}$ is given (cf. [22]), for $\alpha > 0$, by

$$\Phi^{**}_{\alpha 0}(h) = \left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq N-1} |h_i^+|^{1/\alpha} \right)^\alpha + \left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq N-1} |h_i^-|^{1/\alpha} \right)^\alpha , \tag{4.5}$$

where $h_i^+ = \max\{h_i, 0\}$ and $h_i^- = \min\{h_i, 0\}$, while for $\alpha = 0$ it is expressed by (4.3).

By choosing respectively $\Psi_\alpha(h)$ and $\Psi_0(h)$ strictly larger than resp. $|h|_{1/\alpha}$ and $|h|_\infty$ in the remaining orthants (take for example $\Psi_\alpha = \Phi^{**}_{\alpha 0}$, as defined in (4.3) and (4.5)), the minimizers of resp. $\mathcal{F}^\alpha$ and $\mathcal{F}^0$ among non canonical oriented graphs, i.e. tensor measures $\tau \otimes g \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L$ with $|\tau| = 1$ and $|g_i| = 1$ for any $1 \leq i \leq N-1$ (see Remark 2.5), are necessarily acyclic and belong to the canonical class $\Lambda = \tau \otimes g \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L$ with $g_i \in \{0, 1\}$ for any $1 \leq i \leq N-1$.

This may not necessarily be the case, according to the convex extension considered, when it comes to find minimizers of (a convex relaxation of) respectively $\mathcal{F}^\alpha$ and $\mathcal{F}^0$ in suitable classes of weighted graphs with prescribed fluxes at their terminal points, or more generally in the class of rank one tensor valued measures having divergence prescribed by (2.1). Let us consider the following example, where the minimizer contains a cycle.

Example 4.1 Consider the Steiner tree problem for $P_1, P_2, P_3 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with outgoing unit fluxes from P_1 and from P_2 and incoming flux to P_3, in the class of real valued weighted graphs (or more generally, in the class of rank one tensor valued measures satisfying (2.1)). We claim that the minimizer of $\mathcal{F}_0$ within that class is supported on the oriented segments $[P_1, P_2]$, $[P_3, P_2]$, $[P_3, P_1]$, hence it is not acyclic. Denoting τ the global orientation of $L = [P_1, P_2] \cup [P_3, P_2] \cup [P_3, P_1]$ we actually have $\Lambda = \tau \otimes g\mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L$, where

$$\Lambda = \tau \otimes \left([\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}] \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner [P_1, P_2] + [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}] \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner [P_3, P_2] + [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}] \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner [P_3, P_1] \right) . \tag{4.6}$$

The proof of the claim follows from Remark 4.2 and Lemma 4.3.

Remark 4.2 (Calibrations) A way to prove the minimality of $\Lambda = \tau \otimes g\mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner L$ is to exhibit a *calibration* for Λ, i.e. a closed tensor measure-valued differential form ω such that $\|\omega\|_* \leq 1$, where $\|\cdot\|_*$ is the dual norm to $\|\tau \otimes g\| = |\tau|_2 \cdot |g|_\infty$ and $\langle \omega, \Lambda \rangle = |g|_\infty$ pointwise, so that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \langle \omega, \Lambda \rangle = \mathcal{F}^0(\Lambda) \, ,$$

while for any competitor $\Sigma = \tau' \otimes g' \cdot \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner \sigma$ we have $\langle \omega, \Sigma \rangle \leq |g'|_\infty$, and moreover $\Sigma - \Lambda = DU^\perp$, for $U \in SBV(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{Z})$ (see Lemma 2.8), hence

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \langle \omega, \Lambda - \Sigma \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \langle \omega, DU^\perp \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \langle d\omega, U \rangle = 0\,.$$

It follows

$$\mathcal{F}^0(\Sigma) \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \langle \omega, \Sigma \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \langle \omega, \Lambda \rangle = \mathcal{F}^0(\Lambda)\,,$$

i.e. Λ is a minimizer.

Let us construct a calibration $\Theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ for Λ in the general case $P_1 \equiv (x_1, 0)$, $P_2 \equiv (x_2, 0)$ and $P_3 \equiv (0, x_3)$, with $x_1 < 0$, $x_1 < x_2$ and $x_3 > 0$.

Lemma 4.3 *Let P_1, P_2, P_3 defined as above and Λ as in* (4.6). *Consider $\Theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ defined as*

$$\theta_1 = \frac{1}{2a}[(x_1 + a)dx - x_3 dy], \quad \theta_2 = \frac{1}{2a}[(x_1 - a)dx - x_3 dy], \quad \text{for } (x, y) \in B_L$$
$$\theta_1 = \frac{1}{2b}[(x_2 + b)dx - x_3 dy], \quad \theta_2 = \frac{1}{2b}[(x_2 - b)dx - x_3 dy], \quad \text{for } (x, y) \in B_R$$

with B_L the left half-plane w.r.t. the line containing the bisector of vertex P_3, B_R the corresponding right half-plane and $a = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_3^2}$, $b = \sqrt{x_2^2 + x_3^2}$. The tensor valued differential form Θ is a calibration for Λ.

Proof: for simplicity we consider here the particular case $x_1 = -\frac{1}{2}$, $x_2 = \frac{1}{2}$ and $x_3 = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ (the general case is similar). For this choice of x_1, x_2, x_3 we have

$$\theta_1 = \frac{1}{4}dx - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}dy, \quad \theta_2 = -\frac{3}{4}dx - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}dy, \quad \text{for } (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2,\ x < 0,$$
$$\theta_1 = \frac{3}{4}dx - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}dy, \quad \theta_2 = -\frac{1}{4}dx - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}dy, \quad \text{for } (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2,\ x > 0.$$

The piecewise constants 1-forms θ_i, for $i = 1, 2$ are globally closed in $\mathbb{R}^2$ (on the line $\{x = 0\}$ they have continuous tangential component), $\|\Theta\|_* \leq 1$ (cf. Remark 4.2), and taking their scalar product with respectively $(1, 0) \otimes (1/2, -1/2)$, $(-1/2, -\sqrt{3}/2) \otimes (1/2, 1/2)$ for $x < 0$ and $(1/2, -\sqrt{3}/2) \otimes (1/2, 1/2)$ for $x > 0$ we obtain in all cases $1/2$, i.e. $|g|_\infty$, so that

$$\int \langle \Theta, \Lambda \rangle = \mathcal{F}^0(\Lambda)\,.$$

Hence Θ is a calibration for Λ.

□

Remark 4.4 A calibration always exists for minimizers in the class of rank one tensor valued measures as a consequence of Hahn-Banach theorem (see e.g. [23]), while it may

be not the case in general for graphs with integer nor real weights. The classical minimal configuration for (STP) with 3 endpoints P_1, P_2 and P_3 admits a calibration with respect to the norm Φ_{00}^{**} in $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ (see [23]) and hence it is a minimizer for the relaxed functional $\mathcal{F}^0(\Lambda) = ||\Lambda||_{\Phi_{00}^{**}}$ among all real weighted graphs (and all rank one tensor valued Radon measures satisfying (2.1)). It is an open problem to show whether or not a minimizer of the relaxed functional $\mathcal{F}^0(\Lambda) = ||\Lambda||_{\Phi_{00}^{**}}$ has integer weights.

Let us turn next to the convex relaxation of $\mathcal{F}^\alpha$, $0 \leq \alpha < 1$. Following [18], we look for Φ_α^{**}, the positively 1-homogeneous convex envelope on $\mathbb{R}^{d\times(N-1)}$ of $\Phi_\alpha(q) = |\tau| \cdot |g|_{1/\alpha}$ if $q \in K_0$, where

$$K_0 = \{\tau \otimes g \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times(N-1)}, \quad |\tau| = 1, \quad g_i \in \{0,1\} \quad \forall\, 1 \leq i \leq N-1\}, \tag{4.7}$$

and $\Phi_\alpha(q) = +\infty$ otherwise in $\mathbb{R}^{d\times(N-1)}$. Setting $q = [q_1, \ldots, q_{N-1}]$, with $q_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ its columns, we have that the convex conjugate function $\Phi_\alpha^*(q) = \sup\{q \cdot p - \Phi_\alpha(p),\ p \in K_0\}$ is given by

$$\Phi_\alpha^*(q) = \sup\{\, \tau^t \cdot q \cdot g - |g|_{1/\alpha}\,, \quad g = \sum_{i\in J} e_i,\ J \subset \{1, ..., N-1\},\ |\tau| = 1\}\,. \tag{4.8}$$

Hence Φ_α^* is the indicator function of the convex set

$$K^\alpha = \left\{ q \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times(N-1)}, \quad \left|\sum_{i\in J} q_i\right| \leq |J|^\alpha \quad \forall\, J \subset \{1, ..., N-1\} \right\}. \tag{4.9}$$

Remark in particular that for $\alpha = 0$ it holds (cf. [18])

$$K^0 = \left\{ q \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times(N-1)}, \quad \left|\sum_{i\in J} q_i\right| \leq 1 \quad \forall\, J \subset \{1, ..., N-1\} \right\}. \tag{4.10}$$

It follows that Φ_α^{**} is the support function of K^α, i.e., for $p \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times(N-1)}$,

$$\Phi_\alpha^{**}(p) = \sup_{q\in K^\alpha} p \cdot q = \sup\left\{ p \cdot q\,, \ \left|\sum_{i\in J} q_i\right| \leq |J|^\alpha\,,\ J \subset \{1, ..., N-1\} \right\}, \tag{4.11}$$

with $q_1, ..., q_{N-1} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the columns of q.

We restrict now the discussion to the planar case $d = 2$, while we defer the parallel analysis in case $d > 3$ to the companion paper [11]. Consider an $\mathbb{R}^{2\times(N-1)}$ matrix-valued measure $\mu = p|\mu|$, with $|\mu|$ the total variation measure of μ and $p \in \mathbb{R}^{2\times(N-1)}$, $|p| = 1$ $|\mu|$-a.e., such that $\operatorname{div} \mu_i = \delta_{P_N} - \delta_{P_i}$, where μ_i, for $1 \leq i \leq N-1$, are the vector measures corresponding to the columns of μ. Fix a measure Γ as for instance in Remark 2.11. We have $\operatorname{div}(\mu - \Gamma) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and by Poincaré lemma there exists $U \in BV(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^{N-1})$ such that $\mu = \Gamma - DU^\perp$. We are led to consider the relaxed functional

$$\mathcal{E}^\alpha(U) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi_\alpha^{**}(\mu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi_\alpha^{**}(p)\, d|\mu| \quad \text{for } \mu = \Gamma - DU^\perp,\ U \in BV(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^{N-1}). \tag{4.12}$$

The relaxed irrigation problem $(I_\alpha) \equiv \min_{BV} \mathcal{E}^\alpha(U)$ can thus be described in the following equivalent way, according to (4.11): let $q = \varphi$ be any matrix-valued test function (with columns $q_i = \varphi_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq N-1$), we have

$$(I_\alpha) \equiv \min_{U \in BV(\mathbb{R}^2;\mathbb{R}^{N-1})} \sup \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} (Du_i^\perp - \Gamma_i) \cdot \varphi_i \, , \quad \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; K^\alpha) \right\}.$$

Integrating by parts we obtain the equivalent formulation, suitable for numerical discretizations,

$$(I_\alpha) \equiv \min_{U \in BV(\mathbb{R}^2;\mathbb{R}^{N-1})} \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u_i \operatorname{div} \varphi_i^\perp + \int_{\gamma_i} \tau_i \cdot \varphi_i \, d\mathcal{H}^1 \, , \quad \varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2; K^\alpha) \right\}.$$

Notice that with respect to the similar formulation proposed in [18], there is here the presence of an additional "drift" term, moreover the constraints set K^α is somewhat different.

We compare now the functional $\mathcal{E}^\alpha(U)$ with the convex envelope $(\mathcal{F}^\alpha)^{**}(U)$ in $BV(\mathbb{R}^2;\mathbb{R}^{N-1})$, where $\mathcal{F}^\alpha(U) := \mathcal{F}^\alpha(\Gamma - DU^\perp)$ if $\Gamma - DU^\perp = \Lambda$ canonically represents an acyclic graph, and $\mathcal{F}^\alpha(U) = +\infty$ elsewhere in $BV(\mathbb{R}^2;\mathbb{R}^{N-1})$. Observe first that $(\mathcal{F}^\alpha)^{**}(U) = \mathcal{E}^\alpha(U)$ whenever $\Lambda = \Gamma - DU^\perp$ canonically represents a graph connecting $P_1, ..., P_N$, so that $\mathcal{E}^\alpha(U) \leq (\mathcal{F}^\alpha)^{**}(U)$ by convexity of $\mathcal{E}^\alpha(U)$. Moreover, we have $(\mathcal{F}^\alpha)^{**}(U) \leq (\mathcal{F}^1)^{**}(U)$, since $\mathcal{F}^\alpha(U) \leq \mathcal{F}^1(U)$. For $\alpha > 0$, denoting $\mu = \Gamma - DU^\perp$, we deduce

$$(\mathcal{F}^1)^{**}(U) = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} |\mu_i|(\mathbb{R}^d) \leq (N-1)^{1-\alpha} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} |\mu_i|^{1/\alpha} \right)^\alpha (\mathbb{R}^d) \leq (N-1)^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{E}^\alpha(U),$$

and analogously we have $(\mathcal{F}^1)^{**}(U) \leq (N-1)\mathcal{E}^0(U)$. We obtain (cf. Proposition 3.1 of [18])

Lemma 4.5 *We have* $\mathcal{E}^\alpha(U) \leq (\mathcal{F}^\alpha)^{**}(U) \leq (N-1)^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{E}^\alpha(U)$ *for any* $U \in BV(\mathbb{R}^2;\mathbb{R}^{N-1})$ *and any* $0 \leq \alpha < 1$.

5 Numerical identification of optimal structures

5.1 Local optimization by Γ-convergence

In this section, we plan to illustrate the use of Proposition 3.2 to identify numerically local minima of Steiner problem. We base our numerical approximation on a standard discretization of (3.6). Let $\Omega = (0,1)^2$ and assume that the convex hull of the given points $P_1, .., P_N \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is contained in Ω. As a standard consequence, the associated Steiner tree is also contained in Ω. Consider a cartesian grid covering Ω of step size $h = \frac{1}{M}$ where $M > 1$ is a fixed integer. Dividing every square cell of the grid into two triangles, we define a triangular mesh $\mathcal{T}$ associated to Ω.



Figure 1: Rectilinear Steiner trees and associated vectorial drifts for five and seven points

Fix now Γ_i an oriented vectorial measure absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathcal{H}^1$ as in Remark 2.11. Assume for simplicity that Γ_i is supported on γ_i a union of vertical and horizontal segments contained in Ω and covered by the grid associated to the discrete points $\{(kh, lh),\, 0 \leq k, l < M\}$. Notice that such a measure can be easily constructed by considering for instance the oriented ℓ^1-spanning tree of the given points.

To mimic Proposition 3.2, we define the functional space

$$H_i^h \equiv P_1(\mathcal{T}, \Omega \setminus \gamma_i) \cap BV(\Omega)$$

to be the set of functions which are globally continuous on $\Omega \setminus \gamma_i$ and piecewise linear on every triangle of $\mathcal{T}$. Moreover, we require that every function of H_i^h has a jump through γ_i of amplitude $+1$ in the orthogonal direction of the orientation of Γ_i. Observe that H_i^h is a finite dimensional space of dimension M^2: one element u_i^h can be described by $M^2 + n_i$ parameters and n_i linear constraints describing the jump condition where n_i is the number of grid points covered by γ_i.

Then, we define the discrete version of (3.6) by

$$G_h^i(u_i^h) = F_h^i(u_i^h) = \int_{\Omega\setminus\gamma_i} f_h^i(u_i^h) = \int_{\Omega\setminus\gamma_i} |Du_i^h|^2 + \frac{1}{h^2} W(u_i^h), \tag{5.1}$$

if $u \in L^1(\Omega)$ is in H_i^h and extend G_h^i by letting $G_h^i(u) = +\infty$ otherwise. Then we define

$$\mathcal{G}_h^0(u_i^h) = \int_{\Omega\setminus\gamma_i} h \sup_{1\leq i\leq N-1} f_h^i(u_i^h)$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}_h^\alpha(u_i^h) = \int_{\Omega\setminus\gamma_i} h \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} f_h^i(u_i^h)^{1/\alpha} \right)^\alpha .$$

By a similar strategy we used to prove Theorem 3.8, we can establish that we still have

$$\mathcal{G}_h^0 \xrightarrow{\Gamma} c_0\mathcal{F}^0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{G}_h^\alpha \xrightarrow{\Gamma} c_0\mathcal{F}^\alpha$$

with respect to the strong topology of $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2;\mathbb{R}^{N-1})$. Observe that an exact evaluation of the integrals involved in 5.1 is required to obtain this Γ-convergence result. We point out that this constraint is not critical from a computational point of view since every function u_h^i of finite energy has a constant gradient on every triangle of the mesh. On the other hand, the potential integral can be evaluated formally to obtain an exact estimate of this term whith respect to the degrees of freedom which describe a function of H_i^h.



Figure 2: Local minimizers obtained by the Γ-convergence approach applied to 3, 5 and 7 points

Based on these results we performed two different numerical experiments.

We first approximated the optimal Steiner trees associated to the vertices of a triangle, a regular pentagon and a regular hexagon with its center. To obtain the results of figure 2 we discretized the problem on a grid of size 200×200. In the case of the triangle we used the associated spanning tree to define the measures $(\Gamma_i)_{i=1,2}$. In the case of the pentagon and of the hexagon we used the rectilinear euclidean Steiner trees computed by the Geosteiner's library (see [32] for instance) to initiate the vectorial measures. We refer to figure 1 for an illustration of both singular vector fields. We solved the resulting finite dimensional problem using an interior point solver. Notice that in order to deal with the non smooth cost function $\mathcal{G}_h^0(u_i^h)$ we had to introduce standard gap variables to get a smooth non convex constrained optimization problem. Using [17], we have been able to recover the locally optimal solutions depicted in figure 2 in less than five minutes on a standard computer. Whereas the results obtained for the triangle and the pentagon describe globally optimal Steiner trees, the one obtained for the hexagon and its center is only a local minimizer.

In a second experiment we focus on simple irrigation problems to illustrate the versatility of our approach. We applied exactly the same approach to the pentagon setting minimizing the functional $\mathcal{G}_h^\alpha(u_i^h)$. We illustrate our results in figure 3 in which we recover the solutions of Gilbert-Steiner problems for different values of α. Observe that for small values of α, as expected by Proposition 2.7, we recover an irrigation network close to one optimal Steiner tree.



Figure 3: Gilbert-Steiner solutions associated to parameters $\alpha = 0.2$, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8 and 1 (from left to right)

5.2 Convex relaxation and multiple solutions

The convex relaxation of Steiner problem (I_α) obtained following [18] reads in our discrete setting as:

$$\min_{(u_i^h)_{1\leq i<N}} \sup_{(\varphi_i^h)_{1\leq i<N}\in K} \frac{h^2}{2}\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}}\sum_{i=1}^{N-1}(\nabla u_i^h)_t.(\varphi_i^h)_t \tag{5.2}$$

where

$$K = \left\{ (\varphi_i^h)_{1\leq i<N} \in (\mathbb{R}^{2\mathcal{T}})^N \,|\forall P\subset\{1,\dots,N-1\}, \forall t\in\mathcal{T}, |\sum_{p\in P}(\varphi_p^h)_t| \leq 1 \right\} \tag{5.3}$$

and $\forall 1\leq i<N$, $u_i^h \in H_i^h$. Applying conic duality (see for instance Lecture 2 of [9]), we obtain that the optimal vector (u_i^h) solves the following minimization problem

$$\min_{(u_i^h)_{1\leq i<N}\in L,\,(\psi_P^h)_{P\subset\{1,\dots,N-1\}}\in(\mathbb{R}^{2\mathcal{T}})^{2^{N-1}}} \frac{h^2}{2}\sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}}\sum_{P\subset\{1,\dots,N-1\}}|(\psi_P^h)_t| \tag{5.4}$$

where L is the set of discrete vectors $(u_i^h)_{1\leq i<N}$ which satisfy $\forall i=1,\dots,N-1$, $\forall t\in\mathcal{T}$:

$$(\nabla^h u_i^h)_t = \sum_{P\subset\{1,\dots,N-1\},\, i\in P}(\psi_P^h)_t. \tag{5.5}$$

We solved this convex linearly constrained minimization problem using the conic solver of the library Mosek [27] on a grid of dimension 300×300. Observe that this convex formulation is also well adapted to the, now standard, large scale algorithms of proximal type. We studied four different test cases: the vertices of an equilateral triangle, a square, a pentagon and finally an hexagon and its center as in previous section. As illustrated in the left picture of figure 4, the convex formulation is able to approximate the optimal structure in the case of the triangle. Due to the symmetries of the problems, the three last examples do not have unique solutions. Thus, the result of the optimization is expected to be a convex combination of all solutions as it can be observed on the three right cases of figure 4. Whereas the local Γ-convergence approach of previous section was only able

to produce a local minima in the case of the hexagon and its center, the convexified formulation gives a relatively precise idea of the set of optimal configurations (see the last picture of figure 4 and figure 5 for an illustration of the level sets of the functions u_i^h).



Figure 4: Results obtained by convex relaxation for $3, 4$, 5 and 7 given points



Figure 5: Tilling associated to the convex relaxtaion of Steiner tree of seven points (nonuniqueness situation)

6 Generalizations

In this article we have focused on the optimization of one dimensional structures in the plane in specific, classical cases. A first possible generalization is to consider the same problems with respect to more general norms, for instance anisotropic ones: given $|\cdot|_a$ an anisotropic norm on $\mathbb{R}^d$ let respectively $\Phi_\alpha^a(\tau \otimes g) = |\tau|_a \cdot |g|_{1/\alpha}$ and $\Phi_0^a(\tau \otimes g) = |\tau|_a \cdot |g|_\infty$

for $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $|\tau| = 1$ and $g \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}_+$, the positive orthant of $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$. Consider a convex positively 1-homogeneous extension Ψ_α and Ψ_0 of resp. $|\cdot|_{1/\alpha}$ and $|\cdot|_\infty$ to the whole of $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ and form the functionals, for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$

$$\mathcal{F}^\alpha_a(\Lambda) = \int_L \Phi^a_\alpha(\tau \otimes g) d\mathcal{H}^1 = \int_L |\tau|_a \Psi_\alpha(g) d\mathcal{H}^1 = ||\Lambda||_{a,\alpha}\,. \tag{6.1}$$

where $\Phi^a_\alpha(\tau \otimes g) = |\tau|_a \Psi_\alpha(g)$ denotes the corresponding extension of Φ^a_α to $\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$. Then minimizers of $\mathcal{F}^\alpha_a$ solve the anisotropic irrigation problem (resp. the anisotropic Steiner tree problem in case $\alpha = 0$), in particular, if $|\cdot|_a = |\cdot|_1$, $\mathcal{F}^0_a$ corresponds to the rectilinear Steiner tree problem in $\mathbb{R}^d$. For $d = 2$, following [14, 29, 2] one may reproduce the Γ-convergence and convex relaxation approach developed here to numerically study the anisotropic problem (6.1). A further step in this direction would consist in considering size or α-mass minimization problems in suitable homology and/or oriented cobordims classes for one dimensional chains in manifolds endowed with a finsler metric.

Another generalization concerns the convex relaxation and the variational approximation of (STP) and (I_α) in the higher dimensional case $d \geq 3$. This is done in the companion paper [11], where we obtain a full Γ-convergence result by using functionals of Ginzburg-Landau type in the spirit of [1] and [31]. Moreover, as in the present paper, we introduce appropriate "local" convex envelopes, discuss calibration principles and show some numerical simulations.

In parallel to previous theoretical generalizations, we are currently developing numerical approaches adapted to these new formulations. On the one hand, we are studying a large scale approach to solve problems analogous to the conic convexified formulation of section 5.2. Such an extension is definitely required to approximate realistic problems in dimension three and higher. On the other hand, we want to focus on refinement techniques which may decrease dramatically the number of degrees of freedom involved in the optimization process. Observe for instance that very few parameters are required to describe exactly a drift as the ones given in figures 1. Based on such observations, a sequential localized approach may provide a very precise description of, at least locally, optimal structures.

Acknowledgements

Édouard Oudet gratefully acknowledges the support of the ANR through the project COMEDIC and the LabEx PERSYVAL-Lab (ANR-11-LABX-0025-01). We wish to warmly thank Annalisa Massaccesi and Antonio Marigonda for fruitful discussions.

References

[1] Giovanni Alberti, Sisto Baldo, and Giandomenico Orlandi. Variational convergence for functionals of Ginzburg-Landau type. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 54(5):1411–1472, 2005.

[2] Micol Amar and Giovanni Bellettini. A notion of total variation depending on a metric with discontinuous coefficients. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 11(1):91–133, 1994.

[3] Luigi Ambrosio and Andrea Braides. Functionals defined on partitions in sets of finite perimeter. I. Integral representation and Γ-convergence. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 69(3):285–305, 1990.

[4] Luigi Ambrosio and Andrea Braides. Functionals defined on partitions in sets of finite perimeter. II. Semicontinuity, relaxation and homogenization. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 69(3):307–333, 1990.

[5] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Fusco, and Diego Pallara. *Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000.

[6] Sanjeev Arora. Polynomial time approximation schemes for Euclidean traveling salesman and other geometric problems. *J. ACM*, 45(5):753–782, 1998.

[7] Sanjeev Arora. Approximation schemes for NP-hard geometric optimization problems: a survey. *Math. Program.*, 97(1-2, Ser. B):43–69, 2003. ISMP, 2003 (Copenhagen).

[8] Sisto Baldo and Giandomenico Orlandi. Codimension one minimal cycles with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathbb{Z}_p$, and variational functionals on fibered spaces. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 9(4):547–568, 1999.

[9] Ahron Ben-Tal and Arkadi Nemirovski. *Lectures on modern convex optimization: analysis, algorithms, and engineering applications*, volume 2. Siam, 2001.

[10] Marc Bernot, Vicent Caselles, and Jean-Michel Morel. *Optimal transportation networks: models and theory*, volume 1955. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.

[11] Mauro Bonafini, Giandomenico Orlandi, and Édouard Oudet. Variational approximation of functionals defined on 1-dimensional connected sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$. *preprint*, 2016.

[12] Matthieu Bonnivard, Antoine Lemenant, and Filippo Santambrogio. Approximation of length minimization problems among compact connected sets. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 47(2):1489–1529, 2015.

[13] Matthieu Bonnivard, Vincent Millot, and Antoine Lemenant. On a phase field approximation of the planar steiner problem: existence, regularity, and asymptotic of minimizers. *preprint*, 2016.

[14] Guy Bouchitté. Singular perturbations of variational problems arising from a two-phase transition model. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 21(3):289–314, 1990.

[15] Andrea Braides. *Γ-convergence for beginners*, volume 22 of *Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002.

[16] Lorenzo Brasco, Giuseppe Buttazzo, and Filippo Santambrogio. A Benamou-Brenier approach to branched transport. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 43(2):1023–1040, 2011.

[17] Richard H. Byrd, Jorge Nocedal, and Richard A. Waltz. KNITRO: An integrated package for nonlinear optimization. In *Large-scale nonlinear optimization*, volume 83 of *Nonconvex Optim. Appl.*, pages 35–59. Springer, New York, 2006.

[18] Antonin Chambolle, Daniel Cremers, and Thomas Pock. A convex approach to minimal partitions. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 5(4):1113–1158, 2012.

[19] Antonin Chambolle, Benoit Merlet, and Luca Ferrari. A simple phase-field approximation of the Steiner problem in dimension two. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.00519*, 2016.

[20] Thierry De Pauw and Robert Hardt. Size minimization and approximating problems. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 17(4):405–442, 2003.

[21] E. N. Gilbert and H. O. Pollak. Steiner minimal trees. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 16:1–29, 1968.

[22] Andrea Marchese and Annalisa Massaccesi. An optimal irrigation network with infinitely many branching points. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 22(2):543–561, 2016.

[23] Andrea Marchese and Annalisa Massaccesi. The Steiner tree problem revisited through rectifiable G-currents. *Adv. Calc. Var.*, 9(1):19–39, 2016.

[24] Annalisa Massaccesi, Édouard Oudet, and Bozhidar Velichkov. Numerical calibration of Steiner trees. 2016.

[25] Luciano Modica and Stefano Mortola. Un esempio di Γ^--convergenza. *Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. B (5)*, 14(1):285–299, 1977.

[26] Frank Morgan. Clusters with multiplicities in $\mathbb{R}^2$. *Pacific J. Math.*, 221(1):123–146, 2005.

[27] APS Mosek. The MOSEK optimization software. *Online at http://www. mosek. com*, 54, 2010.

[28] Edouard Oudet and Filippo Santambrogio. A Modica-Mortola approximation for branched transport and applications. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 201(1):115–142, 2011.

[29] Nicholas C. Owen and Peter Sternberg. Nonconvex variational problems with anisotropic perturbations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 16(7-8):705–719, 1991.

[30] Emanuele Paolini and Eugene Stepanov. Existence and regularity results for the Steiner problem. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 46(3-4):837–860, 2013.

[31] Etienne Sandier. Ginzburg-Landau minimizers from $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$ and minimal connections. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 50(4):1807–1844, 2001.

[32] DM Warme, Pawel Winter, and Martin Zachariasen. GeoSteiner 3.1. *Department of Computer Science, University of Copenhagen (DIKU)*, 2001.

[33] Qinglan Xia. Optimal paths related to transport problems. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 5(2):251–279, 2003.